

United States Patent and Trademark Office

United States Patent and Trademark	Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS	
P.O. Box 1450	
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450	
www.uspto.gov	

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/829,876	04/10/2001	Shuichi Kikuchi	10417-076001	7681	
26211	7590 07/16/2003				
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 45 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, SUITE 2800 NEW YORK, NY 10111		EXAMI	EXAMINER		
		800	OWENS, DO	OUGLAS W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2811		
		DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003	DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	[±] 09/829, 876	KIKUCHI ET AL.	
J. Contraction of the contractio	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Douglas W Owens	2811	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 16 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ivoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh	ication. A proper reply nich places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the lan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE on which the petition under 37 CFR 1, sion and the corresponding amount of the distallatory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See .136(a) and the appropriate e the fee. The appropriate extent the final Office action; or (2)	e MPEP extension fee nsion fee under as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	·		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims	5.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed	amendment
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		isidered but does NOT	「place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLEL	Y to issues which were	enewly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			•
Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-4</u> .			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disar	proved by the Examir	ner.
9.⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	9.	
10. Other:	SUPERVISORY	M THOMAS PATENT EXAMINER GY CENTER 2800	m7
		OF VENIER 2800	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that the drift region taught by Kwon would not function similarly to a drain region, yet the Applicant teaches the same structure (5A) and refers to it as a drain region (See page 9, lines 1-10 of Applicat's disclosure). Since the structure of the device taught by Kwon is identical to the device of the instant application, it is not seen why it would not have the same function.

The Applicant further asserts that the drain region (24) is separate from the drain region (36). This was set forth in the office action mailed on March 13, 2003. However, Kwon teaches a diffusion step after performing the implant, wherein the diffusion is performed at approximately 1100 degrees Celsius for about 120 - 240 minutes (See Col. 3, lines 6-10). Since the Applicant teaches that first and second drain regions are formed when the implant is diffused and Kwon et al. teaches a similar diffusion step, the first and second drain regions would have inherently resulted from the method disclosed by the Applicant and executed by Kwon et al. The two drain regions resulting from the diffusion step and the separate drain region (36) would have resulted in three drain regions, as claimed in the instant application.